

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended. Claims 10, 11, 16-28, 30-36 and 38 have been cancelled. Claims 1-9, 12-15, 29 and 37 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 23, 24, 29-31 and 38 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Oh et al. (US 6,430,360) (hereinafter "Oh").

Claims 5, 9, 10, 12, 15, 25-28, 32-34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Ward III et al. (US 2002/0013941) (hereinafter "Ward").

Claims 17-22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Abecassis (US 6,504,990) (hereinafter "Abecassis").

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Ward and Abecassis.

Oh discusses a method and apparatus for blocking reproduction of video title in an optical disc player. In Oh, in the reproduction mode (S100), a user is asked to enter a password (S200) corresponding to the chosen/desired rating level. Once the user enters a password (S300), a comparison is made by the microcomputer 110 to check whether the password entered matches the password stored in the apparatus (S400). If it is determined that the password entered is correct (S500), an "OK" message is displayed (S600) and then the microcomputer 110 drives the optical disk through the servo unit 7 so that the recorded signal is reproduced into audio/video data through the RF processing unit 5, the digital signal processor 9, and the MPEG decoder 10 (S800). On the other hand, in the case where the password entered is incorrect for the chosen rating level, a warning message is not displayed while an "OK" message is displayed, as in the case that the correct password is entered (S700). After that, the program chain associated with a "kids safe" or other predetermined non-adult rating contents in the video title is set to the chain of data stream to be decoded in the MPEG decoder 10 and then video data containing the "kids safe" or other predetermined non-adult rating contents are reproduced (S900). Oh, 3:59-4:14 and Figure 6.

Ward discusses a v-chip plus in guide user interface apparatus and method. In Ward, the viewer with the most restrictive ratings/content settings is automatically set as the default.

The default viewer's settings will be used when the television is turned on after the viewer has input the settings. Ward, paragraph [0056].

Abecassis discusses randomly and continuously playing fragments of a video segment. Abecassis, Title.

Claims 1-5 and 11-15

Amended independent claim 1 recites: "...the default viewing level is one of a lowest age level set by an authorized user and a default age level set by a manufacturer of the video reproducing system." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 11. In contrast to claim 1, Oh does not discuss that the default age level may be set by the video manufacturer of the video. Oh only discusses that once a password is entered, a comparison is then made to check whether or not the password entered is correct. If the password is correct, the contents of the video title corresponding to a rating level that the user chose starts to be reproduced. Otherwise, predetermined contents provided in the video title, for example, a "kids safe" version, are reproduced without giving a chance to re-enter a password. See Oh, 3:1-3:7.

By contrast, claim 1 recites that the default viewing level may be a default age level set by a manufacturer of the video reproducing system. This technical feature of claim 1 provides a DVD system that automatically converts the level to an appropriate default level even if an authorized user does not set the parental level after setting the parental level to an adult level. Therefore, the method of claim 1 is convenient to use, and in particular, the method of claim 1 prevents children or teenagers from mistakenly viewing movies corresponding to an adult level even in the absence of setting any levels at all by a user. As this feature is conspicuously absent from the references relied upon by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Oh.

Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 2-5 and 12-15 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Further, claims 2-5 and 12-15 recite features that patentably distinguish over Oh, Ward and Abecassis, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 2 recites that the levels for restricting the reproduction of the video are parental levels in the DVD system.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 6-10

Amended independent claim 6 recites: "...the default viewing level is one of a lowest age level set by an authorized user and a default age level set by a manufacturer of the video

reproducing system.” Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 10. As stated in the Office Action, Oh does not discuss this feature of claim 6. The Examiner relies on Ward to cure this deficiency in Oh. However, Ward only discusses that the viewer with the most restrictive ratings/content settings is automatically set as the default. In Ward, the default viewer's settings will be used when the television is turned on after the viewer has input the settings. See Ward, paragraph [0056]. In contrast to claim 6, Ward does not discuss that the default age level may be set by the video manufacturer of the video. Ward only discusses that the most restricted viewer is set as the default. Claim 6 recites that the default viewing level may be a default age level set by a manufacturer of the video reproducing system. This technical feature of claim 6 provides a DVD system that automatically converts the level to an appropriate default level even if an authorized user does not set the parental level after setting the parental level to an adult level. Therefore, the apparatus of claim 6 is convenient to use, and in particular, the apparatus of claim 6 prevents children or teenagers from mistakenly viewing movies corresponding to an adult level even in the absence of setting any levels at all by a user. As this feature is conspicuously absent from the references relied upon by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Oh and Ward.

Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claims 7-9 depend on claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Further, claims 7-9 recite features that patentably distinguish over Oh, Ward and Abecassis, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 7 recites that the levels for restricting the reproduction of the video are parental levels in the DVD system.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 16-28

Claims 16-28 have been cancelled.

Claim 29

Independent claim 29 recites: “...a controller which determines a viewing level prior to reproduction of the video, controls the reproduction of the video according to the viewing level and resets the viewing level to a default viewing level in response to one of turning the video reproducing system off, the passage of a predetermined wait period and terminating the reproduction of the video...” In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Oh to supply the controller of claim 29. However, Oh does not discuss a controller including a feature of controlling the reproduction to reset the viewing level to a default viewing level in response to

the passage of a predetermined wait period. As a predetermined wait period is not discussed in Oh, it is respectfully submitted that an anticipation rejection cannot be supported by Oh as each element of the claim must be discussed in the relied upon reference.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 30-36

Claims 30-36 have been cancelled.

Claim 37

Claim 37 recites: "...reproducing the video according to the viewing level, wherein the viewing level corresponding to the input password is reset to the default viewing level in response to one of turning the video reproducing system off, the passage of a predetermined wait period and terminating the reproduction of the video." As stated in the Office Action, Oh does not discuss this feature of claim 37. The Examiner relies on Ward to cure this deficiency in Oh. However, Ward only discusses that the default viewer's settings will be used when the television is turned on after the viewer has input the settings. As no mention of resetting the viewing level to a default viewing level after a predetermined wait period is made in either Oh or Ward, it is respectfully submitted that claim 37 patentably distinguishes over Oh and Ward.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claim 38

Claim 38 has been cancelled.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Nov 14, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501